

1  
2  
3                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
5                   AT TACOMA

6                   JOCELYN A. MOULTON,  
7    Plaintiff,  
8                   v.  
9                   CAROLYN W. COLVIN. Commissioner of  
10    Social Security,  
11    Defendant.

Case No. 3:12-cv-06076-RJB-KLS  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
Noted for February 21, 2014

12                   Plaintiff has brought this matter for judicial review of defendant's denial of her  
13 applications for disability insurance and supplemental security income ("SSI") benefits. This  
14 matter has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
15 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule MJR 4(a)(4) and as authorized by Mathews, Secretary of H.E.W. v.  
16 Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). After reviewing the parties' briefs and the remaining record, the  
17 undersigned submits the following Report and Recommendation for the Court's review,  
18 recommending that for the reasons set forth below, defendant's decision to deny benefits be  
19 reversed and this matter be remanded for further administrative proceedings.

20                   FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

21                   On June 30, 2010, plaintiff filed an application for disability insurance benefits and  
22 another one for SSI benefits, alleging in both applications that she became disabled beginning  
23 September 15, 2007, due to depression, anxiety, uncontrolled diabetes, kidney disease, and a  
24 right ankle problem. See ECF #11, Administrative Record ("AR") 12, 207. Both applications

1 were denied upon initial administrative review on October 7, 2010, and on reconsideration on  
2 January 13, 2011. See AR 12. A hearing was held before an administrative law judge (“ALJ”)  
3 on September 13, 2011, at which plaintiff, represented by counsel, appeared and testified, as did  
4 a vocational expert. See AR 28-66.

5 In a decision dated November 18, 2011, the ALJ determined plaintiff to be not disabled.  
6 See AR 12-22. Plaintiff’s request for review of the ALJ’s decision was denied by the Appeals  
7 Council on October 24, 2012, making the ALJ’s decision the final decision of the Commissioner  
8 of Social Security (the “Commissioner”). See AR 1; 20 C.F.R. § 404.981, § 416.1481. On  
9 January 2, 2013, plaintiff filed a complaint in this Court seeking judicial review of the  
10 Commissioner’s final decision. See ECF #3. The administrative record was filed with the Court  
11 on April 16, 2013. See ECF #11. The parties have completed their briefing, and thus this matter  
12 is now ripe for the Court’s review.

13 Plaintiff argues the Commissioner’s final decision should be reversed and remanded for  
14 an award of benefits, or in the alternative for further administrative proceedings, because the ALJ  
15 erred: (1) in evaluating the medical evidence in the record, including the opinions of Alyssa A.  
16 Ruddell, Ph.D., Kristi Breen, Ph.D., Rachelle C. Langhofer, M.D., and Kimberly A. Mebust,  
17 M.D.; (2) in assessing plaintiff’s credibility; (3) in evaluating the lay witness evidence in the  
18 record; (4) in assessing plaintiff’s residual functional capacity; and (5) in finding plaintiff to be  
19 capable of performing her past relevant work. For the reasons set forth below, the undersigned  
20 agrees the ALJ erred in evaluating the opinions of Drs. Ruddell, Breen, Langhofer, and Mebust,  
21 as well as the lay witness evidence in the record, and therefore in assessing plaintiff’s residual  
22 functional capacity and in finding her to be capable of returning to her past relevant work and  
23 thus not disabled. Also for the reasons set forth below, however, while defendant’s decision to  
24

1 deny benefits should be reversed on this basis, the undersigned recommends that this matter be  
2 remanded for further administrative proceedings.

3                   DISCUSSION

4                   The determination of the Commissioner of Social Security (the “Commissioner”) that a  
5 claimant is not disabled must be upheld by the Court, if the “proper legal standards” have been  
6 applied by the Commissioner, and the “substantial evidence in the record as a whole supports”  
7 that determination. Hoffman v. Heckler, 785 F.2d 1423, 1425 (9th Cir. 1986); see also Batson v.  
8 Commissioner of Social Security Admin., 359 F.3d 1190, 1193 (9th Cir. 2004); Carr v. Sullivan,  
9 772 F.Supp. 522, 525 (E.D. Wash. 1991) (“A decision supported by substantial evidence will,  
10 nevertheless, be set aside if the proper legal standards were not applied in weighing the evidence  
11 and making the decision.”) (citing Brawner v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 839 F.2d  
12 432, 433 (9th Cir. 1987)).

13                   Substantial evidence is “such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as  
14 adequate to support a conclusion.” Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971) (citation  
15 omitted); see also Batson, 359 F.3d at 1193 (“[T]he Commissioner’s findings are upheld if  
16 supported by inferences reasonably drawn from the record.”). “The substantial evidence test  
17 requires that the reviewing court determine” whether the Commissioner’s decision is “supported  
18 by more than a scintilla of evidence, although less than a preponderance of the evidence is  
19 required.” Sorenson v. Weinberger, 514 F.2d 1112, 1119 n.10 (9th Cir. 1975). “If the evidence  
20 admits of more than one rational interpretation,” the Commissioner’s decision must be upheld.  
21 Allen v. Heckler, 749 F.2d 577, 579 (9th Cir. 1984) (“Where there is conflicting evidence  
22 sufficient to support either outcome, we must affirm the decision actually made.”) (quoting  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 Rhinehart v. Finch, 438 F.2d 920, 921 (9th Cir. 1971)).<sup>1</sup>

2 I. The ALJ's Evaluation of the Opinions of Dr. Ruddell, Breen, Langhofer, and Mebust

3 The ALJ is responsible for determining credibility and resolving ambiguities and  
 4 conflicts in the medical evidence. See Reddick v. Chater, 157 F.3d 715, 722 (9th Cir. 1998).  
 5 Where the medical evidence in the record is not conclusive, “questions of credibility and  
 6 resolution of conflicts” are solely the functions of the ALJ. Sample v. Schweiker, 694 F.2d 639,  
 7 642 (9th Cir. 1982). In such cases, “the ALJ’s conclusion must be upheld.” Morgan v.  
 8 Commissioner of the Social Sec. Admin., 169 F.3d 595, 601 (9th Cir. 1999). Determining  
 9 whether inconsistencies in the medical evidence “are material (or are in fact inconsistencies at  
 10 all) and whether certain factors are relevant to discount” the opinions of medical experts “falls  
 11 within this responsibility.” Id. at 603.

12 In resolving questions of credibility and conflicts in the evidence, an ALJ’s findings  
 13 “must be supported by specific, cogent reasons.” Reddick, 157 F.3d at 725. The ALJ can do this  
 14 “by setting out a detailed and thorough summary of the facts and conflicting clinical evidence,  
 15 stating his interpretation thereof, and making findings.” Id. The ALJ also may draw inferences  
 16 “logically flowing from the evidence.” Sample, 694 F.2d at 642. Further, the Court itself may  
 17 draw “specific and legitimate inferences from the ALJ’s opinion.” Magallanes v. Bowen, 881  
 18 F.2d 747, 755, (9th Cir. 1989).

---

21  
 22  
 23 <sup>1</sup> As the Ninth Circuit has further explained:

24       . . . It is immaterial that the evidence in a case would permit a different conclusion than that  
 25 which the [Commissioner] reached. If the [Commissioner]’s findings are supported by  
 26 substantial evidence, the courts are required to accept them. It is the function of the  
 [Commissioner], and not the court’s to resolve conflicts in the evidence. While the court may  
 not try the case de novo, neither may it abdicate its traditional function of review. It must  
 scrutinize the record as a whole to determine whether the [Commissioner]’s conclusions are  
 rational. If they are . . . they must be upheld.

Sorenson, 514 F.2dat 1119 n.10.

1           The ALJ must provide “clear and convincing” reasons for rejecting the uncontradicted  
 2 opinion of either a treating or examining physician. Lester v. Chater, 81 F.3d 821, 830 (9th Cir.  
 3 1996). Even when a treating or examining physician’s opinion is contradicted, that opinion “can  
 4 only be rejected for specific and legitimate reasons that are supported by substantial evidence in  
 5 the record.” Id. at 830-31. However, the ALJ “need not discuss *all* evidence presented” to him  
 6 or her. Vincent on Behalf of Vincent v. Heckler, 739 F.3d 1393, 1394-95 (9th Cir. 1984)  
 7 (citation omitted) (emphasis in original). The ALJ must only explain why “significant probative  
 8 evidence has been rejected.” Id.; see also Cotter v. Harris, 642 F.2d 700, 706-07 (3rd Cir. 1981);  
 9 Garfield v. Schweiker, 732 F.2d 605, 610 (7th Cir. 1984).

10           In general, more weight is given to a treating physician’s opinion than to the opinions of  
 11 those who do not treat the claimant. See Lester, 81 F.3d at 830. On the other hand, an ALJ need  
 12 not accept the opinion of a treating physician, “if that opinion is brief, conclusory, and  
 13 inadequately supported by clinical findings” or “by the record as a whole.” Batson v.  
 14 Commissioner of Social Sec. Admin., 359 F.3d 1190, 1195 (9th Cir. 2004); see also Thomas v.  
 15 Barnhart, 278 F.3d 947, 957 (9th Cir. 2002); Tonapetyan v. Halter, 242 F.3d 1144, 1149 (9th Cir.  
 16 2001). An examining physician’s opinion is “entitled to greater weight than the opinion of a  
 17 nonexamining physician.” Lester, 81 F.3d at 830-31. A non-examining physician’s opinion may  
 18 constitute substantial evidence if “it is consistent with other independent evidence in the record.”  
 19 Id. at 830-31; Tonapetyan, 242 F.3d at 1149.

20           A.       Dr. Ruddell

21           Plaintiff challenges the ALJ’s following findings concerning the opinion of Dr. Ruddell:

22           . . . [T]he undersigned gives significant weight to [the opinion of] Dr. Ruddell  
 23 who performed a [state agency] psychological evaluation on the claimant in  
 24 September 2009. Dr. Ruddell found that the claimant is able to reason  
 25 concretely and deal with abstract concepts (7F/5). The claimant is able to

1 understand, remember and learn. The claimant has the ability to concentrate,  
 2 persist and pace (7F/5). Finally, she would have difficulty adapting to new  
 3 situations and coping with change (7F/5). The undersigned gives significant  
 4 weigh [sic] to [the opinion of] Dr. Ruddell because she was able to examine  
 5 the claimant before determining her work restrictions. In addition, her  
 6 opinion is consistent with the objective evidence and treatment records  
 7 regarding the claimant's mental impairments.

8 AR 20-21. Specifically, plaintiff argues that despite the fact that the ALJ stated she was giving  
 9 Dr. Ruddell's opinion significant weight, she failed to adopt all of the functional limitations Dr.  
 10 Ruddell found. The undersigned agrees the ALJ so erred.

11 In her decision, the ALJ found plaintiff was capable of performing simple and some  
 12 complex tasks, and could work in positions that require superficial in-person contact with the  
 13 general public. See AR 17. Dr. Ruddell, however, also found plaintiff to be markedly limited in  
 14 her ability to exercise judgment and make decisions, and moderately limited in her ability to  
 15 learn new tasks, relate appropriately to co-workers and supervisors, respond appropriately to and  
 16 tolerate the pressures and expectations of a normal work setting, care for herself, and maintain  
 17 appropriate behavior in a work setting. See AR 344. Dr. Ruddell further opined that plaintiff's  
 18 "[a]bility to adapt to new situations and emotionally cope with change appears to be an area of  
 19 dysfunction and is severe enough to adversely affect [her] ability to function." Id. The ALJ's  
 20 above assessment of plaintiff's mental functional capabilities does not adequately account for  
 21 these additional limitations.

22 Defendant points to section DI 24510.065(B)(1)(c) of the Commissioner's Program  
 23 Operations Manual System ("POMS")<sup>2</sup> to argue the ALJ did not err here, because that section  
 24 directs medical consultants who complete "Section III of [form] SSA-4734-F4-SUP - Functional  
 25 Capacity Assessment," to "**[i]nclude no severity ratings or nonspecific qualifying terms** (e.g.,

---

26 <sup>2</sup> As noted by defendant, while the POMS "does not have the force of law," the Ninth Circuit has recognized it as being "persuasive authority." Warre v. Commissioner of Social Sec. Admin., 439 F.3d 1001, 1005 (9th Cir. 2006).

1 moderate, moderately severe) to describe limitations” when completing the narrative statement  
2 regarding ability to function, because “[s]uch terms do not describe function and do not usefully  
3 convey the extent of capacity limitation.” See <https://secure.ssa.gov/poms.nsf/links/0424510065>  
4 (emphasis in original). But Dr. Ruddell did not complete form SSA-4734-F4-SUP, and it is not  
5 at all clear the above POMS section was intended to apply to other, state agency forms. Even if  
6 defendant is correct, furthermore, the ALJ still failed to take account of the limitation regarding  
7 adaptability and ability to cope Dr. Ruddell included in the narrative statement she provided in  
8 addition to the moderate to marked limitations she assessed.

10       B.     Dr. Breen

11 Plaintiff also challenges the ALJ’s following findings regarding the opinion of Dr. Breen:

12 Dr. Breen performed a [state agency] psychological evaluation on the  
13 claimant in January 2011. She found that the claimant would “need  
14 encouragement to pursue work but is likely capable if she can find a  
15 position[”] (21F/6). The undersigned gives some weight to Dr. Breen’s  
16 opinion because she had the opportunity to examine the claimant before  
17 opining on her ability to work. However, the undersigned declines to give her  
18 opinion significant weight because she fails to address the specific mental  
19 restrictions that make the claimant “likely capable” of working.

20 AR 21. The undersigned agrees that here too the ALJ erred. Dr. Breen made a number of fairly  
21 specific statements concerning plaintiff’s mental restrictions. For example, she stated plaintiff  
22 “will have trouble with motivation and task completion,” “may have difficulty working with  
23 others because she is easily frustrated and irritated with others,” “is fearful of most everything  
24 and this . . . effects how she interacts with others,” and “will have trouble paying attention to  
25 details.” AR 567. Dr. Breen also assessed plaintiff with moderate limitations in a number of  
26 additional functional areas, including in performing routine tasks without supervision, being  
aware of normal hazards, taking appropriate precautions, communicating and performing  
effectively in a work setting with limited public contact, and maintaining appropriate behavior

1 (see AR 569), which as discussed above are not fully consistent with those the ALJ adopted.

2 Defendant argues any error on the part of the ALJ is harmless<sup>3</sup> here, because Dr. Breen  
 3 opined that plaintiff could probably work assuming she remained in treatment and could find a  
 4 job. But the ALJ did not give this as a basis for discounting Dr. Breen's opinion. See Pinto v.  
 5 Massanari, 249 F.3d 840, 847 (9th Cir. 2001) (court "cannot affirm the decision of an agency on  
 6 a ground that the agency did not invoke in making its decision"); see also Connell v. Barnhart,  
 7 340 F.3d 871, 874 (9th Cir. 2003) (error to affirm ALJ's decision based on evidence ALJ did not  
 8 discuss). Dr. Breen's opinion concerning plaintiff's ability to work, furthermore, is far more  
 9 equivocal than defendant makes it out to be. For example, Dr. Breen stated that plaintiff would  
 10 need "assistance" and "encouragement to pursue work" in order to be able to do so as she "will  
 11 not be able to do this on her own." AR 569. Further, Dr. Breen opined that plaintiff's medication  
 12 "should" make it easier to work, not that it would definitely do so. Id.

14           C.     Dr. Langhofer

15 Plaintiff further finds fault with the ALJ's treatment of Dr. Langhofer's opinion, which  
 16 the ALJ addressed as follows:

18 Dr. Langhofer also performed a [state agency] psychological evaluation on the  
 19 claimant in January 2010. She found that the claimant "seems stable at  
 present" and that "she is likely capable of doing clerical type work" (8F/6).  
 20 The undersigned gives Dr. Langhofer's opinion some weight because she had  
 21 the opportunity to examine the claimant. However, Dr. Langhofer also fails to  
 22 adequately define the claimant's specific mental restrictions and how they  
 23 would affect her ability to perform work. Therefore, the undersigned only  
 gives Dr. Langhofer's opinion some weight (10F/3).

24 AR 21. Again the undersigned agrees the ALJ erred here. As did Breen, Dr. Langhofer pointed  
 25 to fairly specific mental restrictions, such as plaintiff "[w]ould have problems getting along with

26 <sup>3</sup> An error is harmless only if it is "inconsequential" to the ALJ's "ultimate nondisability determination." Stout v.  
Commissioner, Social Security Admin., 454 F.3d 1050, 1055 (9th Cir. 2006) (error harmless where non-prejudicial  
 to claimant or irrelevant to ALJ's ultimate disability conclusion); see also Parra v. Astrue, 481 F.3d 742, 747 (9th  
 Cir. 2007) (finding any error on part of ALJ would not have affected "ALJ's ultimate decision.").

1 people and possible altercations verbally,” and “[w]ould likely have problems relating to people  
2 and situations appropriately.” AR 351. Dr. Langhofer also noted moderate limitations in many  
3 of the same functional areas that both Dr. Ruddell and Dr. Breen did, which once more the ALJ  
4 did not fully encompass in her own assessment of plaintiff’s ability to function. See AR 353. In  
5 addition, the undersigned finds no merit in defendant’s reliance on Dr. Langhofer’s statement  
6 that “[i]f she were stable in treatment she is likely capable of doing clerical type work” (AR 353)  
7 to argue harmless error here, as it is not at all clear the ALJ would have adopted that statement if  
8 she had properly considered the specific mental restrictions Dr. Langhofer found.

10 D. Dr. Mebust

11 The record contains a treatment note from early September 2011, in which Dr. Mebust  
12 found “evidence of severe obstructive sleep apnea,” which she went on to state “may result in  
13 daytime sleepiness.” AR 812. As noted by plaintiff, the ALJ mentioned this opinion, but did not  
14 adopt any limitations stemming from her sleep apnea, finding it had no “more than a minimal  
15 impact on [her] ability to work.” AR 14-15. This plaintiff asserts was error. The undersigned  
16 agrees the ALJ did not sufficiently explain why Dr. Mebust’s opinion would have no more than a  
17 minimal impact on plaintiff’s ability to work. While it is true Dr. Mebust did not opine that  
18 plaintiff’s sleep apnea definitely would cause daytime sleepiness, clearly she felt such would be  
19 a distinct possibility. Given the significant probative nature of this opinion evidence, the ALJ  
20 should have given a more detailed explanation for rejecting it, and her failure to do so was error.  
21 See Embrey v. Bowen, 849 F.2d 418, 421-22 (9th Cir. 1988) (ALJ “must do more than offer his  
22 conclusions” regarding opinion evidence, but rather “must set forth his own interpretations and  
23 explain why they, rather than the doctors’, are correct”).  
24  
25

1 II. The ALJ's Evaluation of the Lay Witness Evidence in the Record

2 Lay testimony regarding a claimant's symptoms "is competent evidence that an ALJ must  
3 take into account," unless the ALJ "expressly determines to disregard such testimony and gives  
4 reasons germane to each witness for doing so." Lewis v. Apfel, 236 F.3d 503, 511 (9th Cir.  
5 2001). In rejecting lay testimony, the ALJ need not cite the specific record as long as "arguably  
6 germane reasons" for dismissing the testimony are noted, even though the ALJ does "not clearly  
7 link his determination to those reasons," and substantial evidence supports the ALJ's decision.  
8 Id. at 512. The ALJ also may "draw inferences logically flowing from the evidence." Sample,  
9 694 F.2d at 642.

10 The record contains lay observations from state agency social worker, Lyna Hixenbaugh,  
11 which read as follows:

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 54 year old woman who arrives a few minutes late to each appointment;  
grooming and dress OK. It took 3 appointments to complete the application  
process because it got to be "too much for her". Movement and thought  
processes slowed. Would often just close her eyes for several seconds while  
formulating an answer, if she remembered at all. At one point, said "Ya  
know, my depression has been worse lately." She stated she would like to  
reschedule again to complete the process. She was originally sent forms to  
complete that would make the process quicker and easier. She got so  
overwhelmed looking at them, that she only got a couple of names written  
down with no other information, then had to stop. Even so, she was as  
cooperative with the process as able. She said at the close of the second apt  
that "I just want to get better and go back to work."

21 AR 215. The ALJ did not mention this evidence in her decision, which plaintiff argues is error.  
22 The undersigned agrees. Defendant asserts the above observations do not constitute significant  
23 probative evidence – and thus the ALJ was not required to consider them – because they "did not  
24 contain any observations that bore on Plaintiff's ability to work." ECF #17, p. 16. The observed  
25 inability to complete the application process, though, clearly does call into question the ability to  
26

1 complete tasks generally, including in the workplace, as do the observed slowed movement and  
2 thought processes.

3 Defendant goes on to assert that even if the ALJ can be said to have erred here, that error  
4 was harmless because Ms. Hixenbaugh simply “summarizes plaintiff’s subjective statements,  
5 such as her statements that her depression has been worse lately and the process of filling out the  
6 forms was ‘too much for her.’” Id.; see also Valentine v. Commissioner Social Security  
7 Administration, 574 F.3d 685 (9th Cir. 2009) (where ALJ rejects lay witness testimony that is  
8 similar to claimant’s subjective complaints for same clear and convincing reasons given to reject  
9 those complaints, those reasons are also germane to lay witness). The ALJ in this case, however,  
10 did not offer any reason for rejecting the lay witness evidence in the record. Indeed, she did not  
11 even address it. As such, the ALJ erred. See Bruce v. Astrue, 557 F.3d 1113, 1115 (9th Cir.  
12 2009) (lay testimony concerning claimant’s ability to work is competent evidence and cannot be  
13 disregarded without comment).

14 As for defendant’s harmless error argument, where “it is ‘obvious from the record . . .  
15 that the error made no difference’” to the ALJ’s ultimate disability determination, that error will  
16 be deemed harmless. Molina v. Astrue, 674 F.3d 1104, 1118 (9th Cir. 2012) (quoting Shinseki v.  
17 Sanders, 556 U.S. 396, 407 (2009)). Further, [w]here lay witness testimony does not describe  
18 any limitations not already described by the claimant, and the ALJ’s well-supported reasons for  
19 rejecting the claimant’s testimony apply equally well to the lay witness testimony, it would be  
20 inconsistent with our prior harmless error precedent to deem the ALJ’s failure to discuss the lay  
21 witness testimony to be prejudicial per se.” Id. at 1116-17. Accordingly, if an ALJ “provided  
22 well-supported grounds for rejecting testimony regarding specified limitations,” the district court  
23 cannot then “ignore the ALJ’s reasoning and reverse the agency merely because the ALJ did not  
24

1 expressly discredit each witness who described the same limitations.” *Id.* at 1121.

2       The problem for defendant, though, is that Ms. Hixenbaugh’s observations do not merely  
 3 summarize plaintiff’s own subjective complaints. For example, while plaintiff in general claims  
 4 problems with attention, memory, concentration, and task completion (see AR 117, 198), as  
 5 noted above Ms. Hixenbaugh’s observations are more specific and go much further, describing  
 6 slowed movements and thought processes, and plaintiff’s apparent need to close her eyes for  
 7 several seconds in order to formulate an answer and to stop the application process due to being  
 8 so overwhelmed (see AR 215). The undersigned thus declines to find harmless error here, as it  
 9 cannot be said that it is obvious from the record that the error in failing to consider the lay  
 10 witness evidence made no difference in the ALJ’s ultimate disability determination.

12       III.     The ALJ’s Assessment of Plaintiff’s Residual Functional Capacity

13       Defendant employs a five-step “sequential evaluation process” to determine whether a  
 14 claimant is disabled. See 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520; 20 C.F.R. § 416.920. If the claimant is found  
 15 disabled or not disabled at any particular step thereof, the disability determination is made at that  
 16 step, and the sequential evaluation process ends. See id. If a disability determination “cannot be  
 17 made on the basis of medical factors alone at step three of that process,” the ALJ must identify  
 18 the claimant’s “functional limitations and restrictions” and assess his or her “remaining  
 19 capacities for work-related activities.” Social Security Ruling (“SSR”) 96-8p, 1996 WL 374184

20       \*2. A claimant’s residual functional capacity (“RFC”) assessment is used at step four to  
 21 determine whether he or she can do his or her past relevant work, and at step five to determine  
 22 whether he or she can do other work. See id.

23       Residual functional capacity thus is what the claimant “can still do despite his or her  
 24 limitations.” Id. It is the maximum amount of work the claimant is able to perform based on all

1 of the relevant evidence in the record. See id. However, an inability to work must result from the  
 2 claimant's "physical or mental impairment(s)." Id. Thus, the ALJ must consider only those  
 3 limitations and restrictions "attributable to medically determinable impairments." Id. In  
 4 assessing a claimant's RFC, the ALJ also is required to discuss why the claimant's "symptom-  
 5 related functional limitations and restrictions can or cannot reasonably be accepted as consistent  
 6 with the medical or other evidence." Id. at \*7.  
 7

8       The ALJ in this case found plaintiff had the residual functional capacity:

9       **... to perform less than the full range of light work . . . in that [the]**  
 10      **claimant can perform positions that require her to stand for 4 hours a**  
      **day intermittently and sit for up to 4 hours a day intermittently. She can**  
      **occasionally climb ramps and stairs. She can perform positions that**  
      **require frequent balancing, kneeling, crawling, crouching and stooping.**  
      **She can perform simple as well as some complex tasks. She can perform**  
      **positions that require superficial in-person general public contact.**

13 AR 17 (emphasis in original). Because as discussed above the ALJ erred in evaluating the  
 14 opinions of Dr. Ruddell, Dr. Breen, Dr. Langhofer, and Dr. Mebust, and in evaluating the lay  
 15 witness evidence in the record, it cannot be said that the ALJ's assessment of plaintiff's residual  
 16 functional capacity is supported by substantial evidence at this time.  
 17

18 IV.     The ALJ's Step Four Determination

19       At step four in the sequential disability evaluation process, the ALJ found plaintiff could  
 20 perform her past relevant work, because that work did not require the performance of work-  
 21 related activities precluded by the residual functional capacity the ALJ assessed. See AR 21.  
 22 The claimant has the burden at step four of the disability evaluation process to show that he or  
 23 she is unable to return to his or her past relevant work. Tackett v. Apfel, 180 F.3d 1094, 1098-99  
 24 (9th Cir. 1999). As discussed above, the ALJ erred in assessing plaintiff with the RFC that she  
 25 did, given the ALJ's errors in evaluating the medical and lay witness evidence in the record. As

1 such, the ALJ's step four determination also cannot be upheld at this time, as it is far from clear  
 2 that it is supported by substantial evidence as well.

3 V. This Matter Should Be Remanded for Further Administrative Proceedings

4 The Court may remand this case "either for additional evidence and findings or to award  
 5 benefits." Smolen, 80 F.3d at 1292. Generally, when the Court reverses an ALJ's decision, "the  
 6 proper course, except in rare circumstances, is to remand to the agency for additional  
 7 investigation or explanation." Benecke v. Barnhart, 379 F.3d 587, 595 (9th Cir. 2004) (citations  
 8 omitted). Thus, it is "the unusual case in which it is clear from the record that the claimant is  
 9 unable to perform gainful employment in the national economy," that "remand for an immediate  
 10 award of benefits is appropriate." Id.

12 Benefits may be awarded where "the record has been fully developed" and "further  
 13 administrative proceedings would serve no useful purpose." Smolen, 80 F.3d at 1292; Holohan  
 14 v. Massanari, 246 F.3d 1195, 1210 (9th Cir. 2001). Specifically, they should be awarded where:

16 (1) the ALJ has failed to provide legally sufficient reasons for rejecting [the  
 17 claimant's] evidence, (2) there are no outstanding issues that must be resolved  
 18 before a determination of disability can be made, and (3) it is clear from the  
 record that the ALJ would be required to find the claimant disabled were such  
 evidence credited.

19 Smolen, 80 F.3d 1273 at 1292; McCartey v. Massanari, 298 F.3d 1072, 1076-77 (9th Cir. 2002).  
 20 Because as discussed above issues still remain in regard to the medical and lay witness evidence  
 21 in the record concerning plaintiff' mental functional capabilities – and therefore in regard to her  
 22 residual functional capacity and ability to perform her past relevant work – remand for further  
 23 consideration of these issues is warranted.

25 Plaintiff argues this matter should be remanded for an award of benefits. However, she  
 26 has failed to establish that the ALJ was required to adopt all of the limitations found by the

1 medical opinion sources discussed herein or the observations noted by the lay witness evidence  
 2 in the record, and therefore that she clearly is incapable of performing her past relevant work at  
 3 this time. Nor has there been any determination by the ALJ as to whether plaintiff is able to  
 4 perform other jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy at step five of the  
 5 sequential disability evaluation process.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, the undersigned declines to find an award  
 6 of benefits is appropriate here.

7

### CONCLUSION

8

9 Based on the foregoing discussion, the undersigned recommends the Court find the ALJ  
 10 improperly concluded plaintiff was not disabled. Accordingly, the undersigned recommends as  
 11 well that the Court reverse defendant's decision to deny benefits and remand this matter for  
 12 further administrative proceedings in accordance with the findings contained herein.

13 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Fed. R. Civ. P.")  
 14 72(b), the parties shall have **fourteen (14) days** from service of this Report and  
 15 Recommendation to file written objections thereto. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file  
 16 objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. See Thomas v. Arn,  
 17 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the clerk  
 18 is directed set this matter for consideration on **February 21, 2014**, as noted in the caption.

19  
 20 DATED this 6th day of February, 2014.

21  
 22 

23  
 24 Karen L. Strombom  
 25 United States Magistrate Judge

26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525  
 526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531  
 532  
 533  
 534  
 535  
 536  
 537  
 538  
 539  
 540  
 541  
 542  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548  
 549  
 550  
 551  
 552  
 553  
 554  
 555  
 556  
 557  
 558  
 559  
 560  
 561  
 562  
 563  
 564  
 565  
 566  
 567  
 568  
 569  
 570  
 571  
 572  
 573  
 574  
 575  
 576  
 577  
 578  
 579  
 580  
 581  
 582  
 583  
 584  
 585  
 586  
 587  
 588  
 589  
 590  
 591  
 592  
 593  
 594  
 595  
 596  
 597  
 598  
 599  
 600  
 601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607  
 608  
 609  
 610  
 611  
 612  
 613  
 614  
 615  
 616  
 617  
 618  
 619  
 620  
 621  
 622  
 623  
 624  
 625  
 626  
 627  
 628  
 629  
 630  
 631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638  
 639  
 640  
 641  
 642  
 643  
 644  
 645  
 646  
 647  
 648  
 649  
 650  
 651  
 652  
 653  
 654  
 655  
 656  
 657  
 658  
 659  
 660  
 661  
 662  
 663  
 664  
 665  
 666  
 667  
 668  
 669  
 670  
 671  
 672  
 673  
 674  
 675  
 676  
 677  
 678  
 679  
 680  
 681  
 682  
 683  
 684  
 685  
 686  
 687  
 688  
 689  
 690  
 691  
 692  
 693  
 694  
 695  
 696  
 697  
 698  
 699  
 700  
 701  
 702  
 703  
 704  
 705  
 706  
 707  
 708  
 709  
 710  
 711  
 712  
 713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718  
 719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729  
 730  
 731  
 732  
 733  
 734  
 735  
 736  
 737  
 738  
 739  
 740  
 741  
 742  
 743  
 744  
 745  
 746  
 747  
 748  
 749  
 750  
 751  
 752  
 753  
 754  
 755  
 756  
 757  
 758  
 759  
 760  
 761  
 762  
 763  
 764  
 765  
 766  
 767  
 768  
 769  
 770  
 771  
 772  
 773  
 774  
 775  
 776  
 777  
 778  
 779  
 780  
 781  
 782  
 783  
 784  
 785  
 786  
 787  
 788  
 789  
 790  
 791  
 792  
 793  
 794  
 795  
 796  
 797  
 798  
 799  
 800  
 801  
 802  
 803  
 804  
 805  
 806  
 807  
 808  
 809  
 810  
 811  
 812  
 813  
 814  
 815  
 816  
 817  
 818  
 819  
 820  
 821  
 822  
 823  
 824  
 825  
 826  
 827  
 828  
 829  
 830  
 831  
 832  
 833  
 834  
 835  
 836  
 837  
 838  
 839  
 840  
 841  
 842  
 843  
 844  
 845  
 846  
 847  
 848  
 849  
 850  
 851  
 852  
 853  
 854  
 855  
 856  
 857  
 858  
 859  
 860  
 861  
 862  
 863  
 864  
 865  
 866  
 867  
 868  
 869  
 870  
 871  
 872  
 873  
 874  
 875  
 876  
 877  
 878  
 879  
 880  
 881  
 882  
 883  
 884  
 885  
 886  
 887  
 888  
 889  
 890  
 891  
 892  
 893  
 894  
 895  
 896  
 897  
 898  
 899  
 900  
 901  
 902  
 903  
 904  
 905  
 906  
 907  
 908  
 909  
 910  
 911  
 912  
 913  
 914  
 915  
 916  
 917  
 918  
 919  
 920  
 921  
 922  
 923  
 924  
 925  
 926  
 927  
 928  
 929  
 930  
 931  
 932  
 933  
 934  
 935  
 936  
 937  
 938  
 939  
 940  
 941  
 942  
 943  
 944  
 945  
 946  
 947  
 948  
 949  
 950  
 951  
 952  
 953  
 954  
 955  
 956  
 957  
 958  
 959  
 960  
 961  
 962  
 963  
 964  
 965  
 966  
 967  
 968  
 969  
 970  
 971  
 972  
 973  
 974  
 975  
 976  
 977  
 978  
 979  
 980  
 981  
 982  
 983  
 984  
 985  
 986  
 987  
 988  
 989  
 990  
 991  
 992  
 993  
 994  
 995  
 996  
 997  
 998  
 999  
 1000  
 1001  
 1002  
 1003  
 1004  
 1005  
 1006  
 1007  
 1008  
 1009  
 10010  
 10011  
 10012  
 10013  
 10014  
 10015  
 10016  
 10017  
 10018  
 10019  
 10020  
 10021  
 10022  
 10023  
 10024  
 10025  
 10026  
 10027  
 10028  
 10029  
 10030  
 10031  
 10032  
 10033  
 10034  
 10035  
 10036  
 10037  
 10038  
 10039  
 10040  
 10041  
 10042  
 10043  
 10044  
 10045  
 10046  
 10047  
 10048  
 10049  
 10050  
 10051  
 10052  
 10053  
 10054  
 10055  
 10056  
 10057  
 10058  
 10059  
 10060  
 10061  
 10062  
 10063  
 10064  
 10065  
 10066  
 10067  
 10068  
 10069  
 10070  
 10071  
 10072  
 10073  
 10074  
 10075  
 10076  
 10077  
 10078  
 10079  
 10080  
 10081  
 10082  
 10083  
 10084  
 10085  
 10086  
 10087  
 10088  
 10089  
 10090  
 10091  
 10092  
 10093  
 10094  
 10095  
 10096  
 10097  
 10098  
 10099  
 100100  
 100101  
 100102  
 100103  
 100104  
 100105  
 100106  
 100107  
 100108  
 100109  
 100110  
 100111  
 100112  
 100113  
 100114  
 100115  
 100116  
 100117  
 100118  
 100119  
 100120  
 100121  
 100122  
 100123  
 100124  
 100125  
 100126  
 100127  
 100128  
 100129  
 100130  
 100131  
 100132  
 100133  
 100134  
 100135  
 100136  
 100137  
 100138  
 100139  
 100140  
 100141  
 100142  
 100143  
 100144  
 100145  
 100146  
 100147  
 100148  
 100149  
 100150  
 100151  
 100152  
 100153  
 100154  
 100155  
 100156  
 100157  
 100158  
 100159  
 100160  
 100161  
 100162  
 100163  
 100164  
 100165  
 100166  
 100167  
 100168  
 100169  
 100170  
 100171  
 100172  
 100173  
 100174  
 100175  
 100176  
 100177  
 100178  
 100179  
 100180  
 100181  
 100182  
 100183  
 100184  
 100185  
 100186  
 100187  
 100188  
 100189  
 100190  
 100191  
 100192  
 100193  
 100194  
 100195  
 100196  
 100197  
 100198  
 100199  
 100200  
 100201  
 100202  
 100203  
 100204  
 100205  
 100206  
 100207  
 100208  
 100209  
 100210  
 100211  
 100212  
 100213  
 100214  
 100215  
 100216  
 100217  
 100218  
 100219  
 100220  
 100221  
 100222  
 100223  
 100224  
 100225  
 100226  
 100227  
 100228  
 100229  
 100230  
 100231  
 100232  
 100233  
 100234  
 100235  
 100236  
 100237  
 100238  
 100239  
 100240  
 100241  
 100242  
 100243  
 100244  
 100245  
 100246  
 100247  
 100248  
 100249  
 100250  
 100251  
 100252  
 100253  
 100254  
 100255  
 100256  
 100257  
 100258  
 100259  
 100260  
 100261  
 100262  
 100263  
 100264  
 100265  
 100266  
 100267  
 100268  
 100269  
 100270  
 100271  
 100272  
 100273  
 100274  
 100275  
 100276  
 100277  
 100278  
 100279  
 100280  
 100281  
 100282  
 100283  
 100284  
 100285  
 100286  
 100287  
 100288  
 100289  
 100290  
 100291  
 100292  
 100293  
 100294  
 100295  
 100296  
 100297  
 100298  
 100299  
 100300  
 100301  
 100302  
 100303  
 100304  
 100305  
 100306  
 100307  
 100308  
 100309  
 100310  
 100311  
 100312  
 100313  
 100314  
 100315  
 100316  
 100317  
 100318  
 100319  
 100320  
 100321  
 100322  
 100323  
 100324  
 100325  
 100326  
 100327  
 100328  
 100329  
 100330  
 100331  
 100332  
 100333  
 100334  
 100335  
 100336  
 100337  
 100338  
 100339  
 100340  
 100341  
 100342  
 100343  
 100344  
 100345  
 100346  
 100347  
 100348  
 100349  
 100350  
 100351  
 100352  
 100353  
 100354  
 100355  
 100356  
 100357  
 100358  
 100359  
 100360  
 100361  
 100362  
 100363  
 100364  
 100365  
 100366  
 100367  
 100368  
 100369  
 100370  
 100371  
 100372  
 100373  
 100374  
 100375  
 100376  
 100377  
 100378  
 100379  
 100380  
 100381  
 100382  
 100383  
 100384  
 100385  
 100386  
 100387  
 100388  
 100389